

(1)

Edward Fitzgerald, *Esq;* - - Appellant.

Thomas Fitzgerald, *Gent.* - - Respondent.

The Appellant's C A S E.

THE Appellant having at several Times from the Year 1706 till 1712 paid and advanced to the Respondent *Thomas Fitzgerald* several considerable Sums of Money, amounting in the whole to the Sum of 600 *l.* he the Respondent, for securing thereof, executed unto the Appellant one Bond or Obligation of the Penalty of 1200 *l.* conditioned for the Payment of the said 600 *l.* with Warrant of Attorney to confess Judgment for the same.

That the Appellant, after several Years Forbearance, out of Compassion for his the Respondent's low Circumstances, until he came into the Possession of a very considerable Fortune in the Year 1724, did then apply to him the Respondent for Payment of the said 600 *l.* and Interest; which the Respondent neglecting to comply with, the Appellant found himself under a Necessity of threatening to put the said Obligation in Suit for the Recovery of his said Debt; whereupon the Respondent, merely for Delay, and to stay the Appellant's Proceeding at Law against him, exhibited his Bill against the Appellant in *Easter Term 1724* in his Majesty's High Court of Chancery in *Great Britain*, for Relief against the said Bond and Warrant of Attorney, and therein set forth several false and fictitious Suggestions, and among others, falsely suggested, that the said Bond was perfected for a Marriage Brokage, and that the same was by Agreement not to have affected him during his Life, but was to have been a Demand on his the Respondent's Executors or Administrators, with several other false and fictitious Suggestions.

Bill in the Court
of Chancery of
England, Easter
Term 1724.

To this Bill the Appellant having put in his Answer, he particularly and at large insisted on the Payment of the said Sum of 600 *l.* and by his said Answer absolutely denied the said several Suggestions made in the said Bill concerning the Consideration of the said Bond, and the Manner of obtaining it, and swore that the said Bond was justly perfected for the Considerations herein before mentioned.

8 June, 1725.

The said Cause being at Issue, several Witnesses were examined on both Sides, and the same coming on to be Heard on the Eighth Day of *June*, in the Eleventh Year of his late Majesty King *George* the First's Reign, in the Presence of Counsel learned on both Sides, before the Right Honourable the now Lord High Chancellor of *Great Britain*, and after long Debate, and on reading the several Proceedings and Proofs in the said Cause, by which the Appellant had in the clearest and most undeniable

undeniable Manner established the Reality of the said Debt secured by the said Obligation against the several Suggestions of the said Bill, which appeared to be wholly destitute of any Foundation whatsoever; and due Consideration being had of what was offered, his Lordship was pleased to order and decree, that the Respondent's Bill should stand absolutely dismissed, with Costs; as in and by the said Bill, Answer, Proofs, and decretal Order of Dismission, remaining as of Record in the said High Court of Chancery in *Great Britain*, may more fully and at large appear.

The Respondent, far from attempting to controvert the Justice of that Decree, either by petitioning for a Re-hearing, or by appealing against such Decree, suffered the same to be duly enrolled; but to elude the Force thereof, and to avoid making any Satisfaction to the Appellant for his said Debt and Costs of Court, the Respondent immediately withdrew into *Ireland*, where the Appellant with great Difficulty three Years afterwards procured the Respondent to be arrested for the Debt due on the said Bond.

26 Nov. 1728.
New Bill filed in
the Court of Ex-
chequer in Ire-
land.

Whereupon the Respondent caused a Bill to be filed against the Appellant in the Chancery Side of his Majesty's Court of Exchequer in *Ireland*, on the 26th of *November* 1728, merely for further Delay, and for the same Relief and Matter, and upon the very same Allegations with those already set forth in the Bill so dismissed in the High Court of Chancery in *Great Britain*, and no other, save only a Collusion which he charged between the Appellant and his the Respondent's Agent, and that he the Respondent was not in *London* when the said Cause was heard in the said High Court of Chancery.

The Appellant then and now living in *London*, could not plead or answer within the usual Time, and being for it to pray a *Dedimus* to put in his Answer, the Respondent obtained an Injunction of Course.

Plea, 28 April
1730.

To this Bill the Appellant on the 28th of *April* 1730 filed his Plea, and pleaded at large the said Bill, Answer, Proceedings, and Decree of Dismission inrolled, in Bar of so much of the said Bill as sought to draw in Question again the same Matters which he had before set forth in his former Bill, with the proper Averments of the Identity of the Persons, the Bond, and other particular Things mentioned in the Decree of Dismission, with those specified in the Bill and Plea, and by his Answer denied the fictitious Charge of Collusion or Combination with the Respondent's Agent in *England*, or that the Respondent was not in *London* at the Time the said Cause was heard, which were the only new Matters in the said Bill suggested or mentioned which had not been insisted upon and put in Issue in the former Cause in *England*: And the said Plea on the 23d of *June* 1730 coming to be argued in the said Court of Exchequer in *Ireland*, the Court did not think proper to allow the said Plea, and dissolve the said Injunction obtained by the Respondent, as herein before set forth, as the Appellant is advised they ought to have done; but were only pleased to order, that the Benefit of the said Plea should be reserved until the Hearing the said Cause.

23 June, 1730.
the Plea argued.

From

(3)

From which Order the Appellant hath appealed to your Lordships, and humbly conceives he is greatly aggrieved thereby, and that the same is Erroneous, and ought to be Reversed, and that the Appellant's Plea ought to be allowed, with Costs, and the said Injunction dissolved, for the following, among many other R E A S O N S:

- I. For that the said Court of Exchequer had no sort of Right to examine into the Justice of the Decree pronounced by the High Court of Chancery of *Great Britain* in the former Cause, and therefore ought not to have let the Respondent into a fresh Enquiry touching any Thing which had there received a final Determination; but to have allowed the Appellant's Plea as an absolute Bar to so much of the new Bill as sought to draw the same Matter in Question a second Time.
- II. For that as the Respondent has had the Merits of his pretended Equity already tried in a Court that had certainly full Jurisdiction, and found against him, it would be a most unreasonable Delay of Justice to the Appellant to make him wait for it till the same Merits shall be tried over again in the present Cause.
- III. And it is most humbly apprehended, that as this is the first Instance where any Court of Judicature in a dependent Dominion ever claimed or pretended to a Jurisdiction of this kind, so it might become a Precedent of the most dangerous Consequence to all such Suitors as should be under the unhappy Necessity of following thither the Persons of their Creditors out of this Kingdom to come at Justice, as the Appellant hath been obliged to do in the present Case, after a most expensive Suit.

WHEREFORE the Appellant humbly hopes, the said Plea shall be allowed, with Costs, and the said Injunction shall be dissolved; or that your Lordships will make such further Order for the Appellant's Relief, as to your Lordships, in your great Wisdom, shall seem meet.

D. RYDER.

EDM. MALONE.

Edward Fitzgerald, Esq; Appellant.
Thomas Fitzgerald, Gent. Respondt.

The Appellant's CASE.

*To be Heard at the Bar of the House
of Lords on Friday the 23d of
April, 1731.*

No Counsel appearing for the Respondt. and the
Appell^t. Counsel being heard the Order of the Court of
Chancery in Ireland was Revers'd the Appell^t. Plea
Allow'd and the Injunction obtain'd by the Respondt.
Dissolv'd.